

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Criminal Investigation Division
Investigative Activity Report**

Case Number

0506-0026

Case Title:

Ferguson Enterprises Inc.

Reporting Office:

Detroit, MI, Resident Office

Subject of Report:

Interview of (b)(6), (b)(7)(b)(6), former employee of the Detroit Human Rights Department

Activity Date:

September 23, 2010

Reporting Official and Date:

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C), RAC

26-SEP-2010, Signed by: (b)(6), (b)(7), RAC

Approving Official and Date:

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C), SAC

29-SEP-2010, Approved by: (b)(6), (b)(7), ASAC

SYNOPSIS

09/23/2010 - U.S. EPA CID Special Agent (SA) (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) interviewed (b)(6), (b)(7)(b)(6), Principal Analyst, Detroit Water and Sewerage Department (DWSD).

DETAILS

On September 23, 2010, U.S. EPA CID Special Agent (SA) (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) interviewed (b)(6), (b)(7)(b)(6), Principal Analyst, Detroit Water and Sewerage Department (DWSD). Also present was (b)(6), (b)(7)(b)(6), Deputy Corporation Counsel, City of Detroit Law Department and Assistant U.S. Attorney Mark Chutkow. (b)(6) was interviewed regarding the certification of DLZ and other entities during (b)(6) tenure at the Detroit Human Rights Department. (b)(6) was informed of the identity of the interviewing agent and the purpose of the interview. (b)(6) provided the following information:

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C) (b)(6), (b)(7)(b)(6) t, Detroit, Michigan; cell: (b)(6), (b)(7) ; DOB: (b)(6),

(b)(6) has been employed by the City of Detroit for the past 16 years in a variety of positions. In 2000 (b)(6) was employed by the DWSD as a Senior Typist, in 2001 became a Business Technician with the Detroit Human Rights Department (HRD) where (b)(6) later was promoted to a Principal Analyst. In 2008 (b)(6) was on extended sick leave and returned to city employment at the DWSD Materials Management group in 2009.

(b)(6) recalled being involved in the review of the DLZ Detroit Headquartered Business (DHB) certification application. After reviewing the application and accompanying documents (b)(6) was not comfortable approving the certification. (b)(6) was not comfortable making the determination given the broad definition of DHB as set in the ordinance and the fact that DLZ seemed to have multiple locations in the country. (b)(6) explained this to (b)(6) supervisor, (b)(6), (b)(7)(b)(6) and gave (b)(6) the file to review. (b)(6) thought that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) was the Director of HRD at the time but added that DLZ's renewal applications were also reviewed and approved under (b)(6), (b)(7)(b)(6) tenure as Director. At some point (b)(6) learned that (b)(6) had approved DLZ's DHB certification.

(b)(6) learned that the DLZ certification was revoked by HRD and assumed that it was due to the way they had organized the company with the multiple locations. (b)(6) thought that (b)(6) is the one who told (b)(6) it had been revoked but was never told why. This is the only revocation of a certification that (b)(6) is aware of. (b)(6) is not aware of anything which had changed in DLZ's status or documentation which could have caused the revocation.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the EPA.
It is the property of the EPA and is loaned to your agency;
it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Criminal Investigation Division
Investigative Activity Report**

Case Number

0506-0026

In 2006 (b)(6), heard in passing from (b)(6), that DLZ's DHB certification had been reinstated. (b)(6), commented to (b)(6), that another company's certification had been reinstated like DLZ's had. This was the first (b)(6), had heard that the DLZ DHB certification was reinstated.

(b)(6), recalled having questions regarding DLZ's status during their annual renewal process for the DHB certification and passing along those issues to (b)(6),. The annual renewal was approved by (b)(6),. At some point in 2007 (b)(6), asked (b)(6), to pull several files for review, one of which was DLZ's file. (b)(6), left the HRD in July of 2008.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the EPA.
It is the property of the EPA and is loaned to your agency;
it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.